

Panaji, 17th September, 2020 (Bhadra 26, 1942)

SERIES II No. 25

OFFICIAL GAZETTE

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Agriculture

Directorate of Agriculture

Order

No. 2/9/95-AGR/2020-21/Part(II)/810

On recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee conveyed by Goa Public Service Commission vide their letter No. COM/II/11/2 (1)/2020/580 dated 15-07-2020, Government is pleased to promote Shri Shivdas Gaonkar, Agriculture Officer, Group 'B' Gazetted posted as Farm Superintendent, Kalay to the post of Assistant Director of Agriculture, Group 'A' Gazetted, in the Directorate of Agriculture under Scheduled Tribe Category on regular basis in the Pay Matrix at Level-10 of the 7th Pay Commission with immediate effect.

On promotion he is posted as below:

Sr. No.	Name of the Agriculture Officer	Place of posting on promotion on regular basis
1.	Shri Shivdas Gaonkar (ST)	Against the post of Assistant Director of Agriculture (FT), Farmers Training Centre, Ela, Old Goa vacated by Shri Anant Hoble on transfer.

Shri Shivdas Gaonkar shall exercise his option within one month from the date of promotion to fix his pay in terms of F.R. 22(I) (a) (1).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Nevil Alphonso, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Agriculture).

Tonca-Caranzalem, 10th September, 2020.

Order

No. 2/9/95-AGR/2020-21/Part(II)/812

On recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee conveyed by Goa Public Service Commission vide their letter No. COM/II/11/2 (2)/2018/581 dated 15-07-2020, Government is pleased to promote Shri Sandesh Jiva Raut Dessai, Assistant Agriculture Officer to the post of Agriculture Officer, Group 'B' Gazetted, in the Directorate of Agriculture on regular basis in the Pay Matrix of Level-7 of the 7th Pay Commission with immediate effect.

On promotion he shall continue at the same place of his posting as shown below:

- 1) Shri Sandesh Jiva Raut Dessai, Zonal Agriculture Officer, Zonal Agriculture Office, Quepem.

Shri Sandesh Jiva Raut Dessai shall exercise his option within one month from the date of promotion to fix his pay in terms of F.R. 22(I) (a) (1).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Nevil Alphonso, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Agriculture).

Tonca-Caranzalem, 10th September, 2020.

Order

No. 2/9/95-AGR/2020-21/Part(II)/808

On recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee conveyed by Goa Public Service Commission vide their letter No. COM/II/11/2 (3)/2011/579 dated 15-07-2020, Government is pleased to promote Shri Vithal Joshi, Assistant Director of Agriculture (INM) to the post of Dy. Director of Agriculture, Group 'A' Gazetted, in the Directorate of Agriculture on regular basis in the Pay Matrix at Level-11 of the 7th Pay Commission with immediate effect.

On promotion he is posted as below:			1	2	3
Sr. No.	Name of the officer	Place of posting on promotion on regular basis	District Agriculture Office, North thereby relieving Shri Sanjeev Mayekar of additional charge.		
1	2	3			
1.	Shri Vithal Joshi	Against the vacant Dy. Director of Agriculture (Crops & PP), Directorate of Agriculture, Tonca, Caranzalem by relieving Shri Shivanand Wagle of additional charge. Shri Joshi shall also hold additional charge of	Shri Vithal Joshi shall exercise his option within one month from the date of promotion to fix his pay in terms of F.R. 22(I) (a) (1). By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa. <i>Nevil Alphonso</i> , Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Agriculture). Tonca-Caranzalem, 10th September, 2020.		

Order

No. 2/9/95-AGR/2020-21/Part(II)/811

On recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee conveyed by Goa Public Service Commission vide their letter No. COM/II/11/2(1)/2020/580 dated 15-07-2020, Government is pleased to promote and appoint the following Agriculture Officers, Group 'B' Gazetted to the post of Assistant Director of Agriculture, Group 'A' Gazetted on officiating basis in the Pay Matrix at Level-10 of the 7th Pay Commission with immediate effect until further orders or till the post is filled on regular basis whichever is earlier.

- 1) Shri Dattaprasad Dessai.
- 2) Shri Anil A De Noronha.

On promotion on officiating basis, they shall be posted as below:

Sr. No.	Name of the officer and place of posting	Place of posting on officiating basis	Budget Head
1.	Shri Dattaprasad Dessai, Agriculture Officer on deputation to Goa State Horticulture Corporation Ltd., against the post of Manager (Farms)	As Assistant Director of Agriculture (Hort.), Directorate of Agriculture, Tonca, Caranzalem vacated by Shri Pradeep Malik on transfer	2401-00-109-05-01.
2.	Shri Anil A De Noronha, Agriculture Officer on deputation to Agriculture Technology Management Authority (A.T.M.A.), North against the post of Dy. Project Director	Against the vacant post of Subject Matter Specialist (Horticulture), Krishi Vigyan Kendra, South, by relieving Shri Chandrahas Dessai of additional charge	2415-01-150-01-01.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Nevil Alphonso, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Agriculture).

Tonca-Caranzalem, 10th September, 2020.

Department of Co-operation

Office of the Registrar of Co-operative Societies

Order

No. 3/9/Urban Credit/TS-II/PZ/2018/
/RCS/Suppl/1908

- Read: 1. Circular No. 6-13-81/EST/RCS/Part V/5833 dated 06-03-2020.
2. Order No. 48-8-2001-TS-RCS-III/311 dated 21-04-2017.
3. Letter No. 1/2009-10/Dispute/AR(Dairy)/399 dated 24-06-2020.
4. Letter No. PUCCS/ARCS/20-21/25 dated 15-06-2020 from The Ponda Urban Co-op. Credit Society Ltd., Ponda-Goa.

In exercise of powers under Section 123(B) of Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, I, the Registrar of Co-operative Societies, hereby appoint Adv. Reena D. Naik Rasaikar, Ponda-Goa as Registrar's Nominee (hereinafter referred to as the nominee) from the existing list of empanelled Registrar's Nominee to adjudicate the disputes referred to her by The Ponda Urban Co-operative Society Ltd., Ponda-Goa.

Once any dispute is referred by the above mentioned society to the above named Nominee is also authorised under Section 86(1) to first decide the issue if the matter referred involves a dispute requiring arbitration.

Only upon the nominee being satisfied that there exists a dispute she is authorised to arbitrate on the same and give his award.

This order is subject to the following conditions:-

1. The Nominee appointed is required to maintain all the case files in terms of civil manual issued by the Hon'ble High Court for the guidance of all the subordinate courts keeping in view the provisions of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act & Rules.
2. The Nominee shall refrain herself from representing before any other Registrar's Nominee/Board of Nominee as a legal practitioner of a party to the dispute under the provisions of Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001.
3. Arbitration fee shall be charged as per Order No. 41-3-85/TS/RCS/516 dated 24-05-2010.

4. This order shall remain in force for one year unless extended, the Order can also be withdrawn at anytime without assigning any reasons by the undersigned.

Vikas S. N. Gaunekar, Registrar (Co-operative Societies).

Panaji, 7th September, 2020.

Order

No. 50/3(238)/Elec/BOD/ECHS/RCS/NZ/18/1913

Read: Letter No. AR/NZ/ELEC/GEN/2020/266 dated 29-06-2020 received from Asstt. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa-Goa to fill one vacant post of Directors.

In exercise of powers conferred under Section 126A of the Goa Co-operative Societies, Act, 2001, the Government is pleased to grant relaxation on applicability of sub-section 4 of Section 59 to Eternia Co-op. Housing Society Ltd., Shetyevaddo, Mapusa-Goa, for the period 2018 to 2023.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vikas N. Gaunekar, Registrar & ex officio Joint Secretary (Co-op. Societies).

Panaji, 09th September, 2020.

Addendum

No. 15-99-88-ADT/RCS(Suppl)/1911

Read: Order No. 15-99-88/ADT/RCS(Suppl)/1368 dated 29-07-2020.

In exercise of the powers conferred under Section 74(2) of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, Government is pleased to include the name of the below mentioned Chartered Accountant in the Panel of Auditor under "Class A" in the order read above as under.

Sr. No.	Name & address of Chartered Accountant	Tel./Mobile No. Email	Firms Registration/ Membership No.
136.	Shri Lilesh Shital Prabhu Nasnodkar, Chartered Accountant, L. S. Prabhu Nasnodkar & Co., 207 Govinda Building, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Panaji-Goa 403001	9326102254 Email lilesh.nasnodkar@gmail.com	Membership No. 133454

All other terms and conditions mentioned in the order read above remains the same for this inclusion also.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vikas S. N. Gaunekar, Registrar & ex officio Joint Secretary (Co-op. Societies).

Panaji, 09th September, 2020.

Office of the Asst. Registrar of Co-operative Societies

No. 13/51/86/New India/ARCZ/824

Read: Show Cause Notice No. 13/51/86/New India/ /ARCZ dated 15-01-2020.

A show cause notice referred to hereinabove was issued to all the Directors on the Board of the New India Assurance Co-operative Credit Society Ltd., Patto, BSNL Bldg., 7th Floor, Panaji to Show Cause as to why the affairs of the society should not be wound up.

The hearing in the matter was fixed on 14-07-2020 at 11.00 a.m. However, neither the directors remained present for the hearing in person nor submitted their written reply, which gives scope to believe that they have nothing to say in the matter. Moreover, from the documents available with this office it is clear that the society has not complied with the statutory requirement from last many years and also not submitted the status as regards to the functioning of the society.

From the above facts and circumstances, inference can be drawn that no purpose will be served if the society is allowed to continue further and therefore being satisfied that this is fit case for winding up the affairs of the society. I am therefore, inclined to pass the following interim order:

Order

In exercise of the powers vested in me under sub-section (1) of Section 92 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 read with Rule 127 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003, I, P. S. Sawant, Asstt. Registrar of Co-operative Societies, Central Zone, Panaji, hereby, direct and order that New India Assurance Co-operative Credit

Society Ltd., Patto, BSNL Bldg., 7th Floor, Panaji registered under Code Symbol No. ARCS/CZ-3(b)-3/Goa dated 17-11-1982 be wound up.

Further, in exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 93(1) of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 read with Rule 129 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003, I, hereby appoint Smt. Sushila Bandodkar, Sr. Auditor, Co-operative Societies, Central Zone, Panaji as the Liquidator of the New India Assurance Co-operative Credit Society Ltd., Patto, BSNL Bldg., 7th Floor, Panaji.

P. S. Sawant, Asstt. Registrar (Co-op. Societies), Central Zone.

Panaji, 7th September, 2020.

Department of Forest

Order

No. 4/2/2001-02/FOR(Part)/170

On recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee as conveyed by the Goa Public Service Commission vide letter No. COM/II/11/22(1)/2011/616 dated 21-08-2020, the Governor of Goa is pleased to promote Shri Paresch C. Porob, Range Forest Officer (RFO) to the post of Assistant Conservator of Forest (ACF), Group "B" Gazetted in the pay scale of PB-2 Rs. 9,300-34,800+ Grade Pay 4,600 (level-7 of the 7th Pay Commission) on regular basis, in the Office of the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Forest Department, Panaji, with immediate effect.

The above officer shall be on probation for a period of 02 years.

The above officer shall exercise the option for fixation of pay within one month from the date of this order in terms of F. R. 22(I)(a)(1).

The pay of officer on promotion shall be fixed as per C.C.S. (RP) Rules, 2016.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shaila G. Bhosle, Under Secretary (Forests).

Porvorim, 09th September, 2020.

Goa State Information Commission

Order

No. GSIC/Admn/O.O/2020/547

In pursuance to Clause 5 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as "The said Act"), the following officers/officials are hereby appointed as Public Information Officer/Assistant Public Information Officer and First Appellate Authority for the office of Goa State Information Commission, to deal with the application received from the public under the said Act.

Sr. No.	Name & designation of the Public Information Officer	Name & designation of the Assistant Public Information Officer	Designation of the First Appellate Authority	Jurisdiction
1.	Smt. Alexandrina Vaz, Sr. Steno Grade I	Smt. Arlene D. Cunha, LDC	Under Secretary-cum- -Registrar	State of Goa.

The above designated officers/officials shall exercise and perform the powers/functions laid down under the RTI Act, 2005.

This order supersedes all the earlier order issued in this regards and shall come into force with immediate effect.

Shri *Vinesh Arlenkar*, Secretary (Goa State Information Commission).

Panaji, 10th September, 2020.

Department of Labour

Notification

No. 28/2/2020-LAB/944

The following Award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on 07-08-2020 in reference No. IT/19/94 is hereby published as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Fatima S. De Souza, Under Secretary (Labour)
(Link).

Porvorim, 07th September, 2020.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AND
LABOUR COURT
GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI

(Before Mr. Vincent D'Silva Hon'ble Presiding
Officer)

Ref. No. IT/19/94

Workmen,
Represented by the
General Secretary,
Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh,
Kamakshi Krupa, Gr. Floor,
Ponda-Goa.

... Workmen/Party I

V/s

M/s. Dupont Sportswear Ltd.,
Plot No. 82-85, Bicholim
Industrial Estate,
Bicholim-Goa.

... Employer/Party II

Workmen/Party I represented by Adv. S. P. Gaonkar
along with Shri P. Gaonkar.

Employer/Party II represented by Ld. Adv. Shri P.
Chawdikar.

AWARD

(Delivered on this the 7th day of the month
of August of the year 2020)

By Order dated 16-08-1993, bearing No. 28/33/
/93-LAB, the Government of Goa in exercise of
powers conferred by Section 10 (1)(d) of the
Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the dispute
for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa,
Daman and Diu at Panaji, Goa, constituted under
Section 7-A of the said Act.

- (1) Whether the action of the management of M/s Dupont Sportswear Ltd., Bicholim, in refusing to provide employment to the following 52 workmen mentioned in Schedule-I below, with effect from 11-01-1993 by demanding individual explanation from each one of them even after the Union had informed the management that the strike has been called off, is legal and justified and whether this amounts to lock-out?

SCHEDULE – I

1. Bharati Tari.
2. Anjani Parab.
3. Lalita Parrakar.
4. Rakha Ghadi.
5. Mangal Valvaikar.
6. Suvarna Vadkar.
7. Gomati Mandrekar.
8. Aruna Korbarkar.
9. Maya Chandi.
10. Geeta Shirodkar.
11. Shevanti Naik.
12. Mahananda Ghadi.
13. Manda Vadkar.
14. Revati Kubal.
15. Manda Tari.
16. Shital Parab.
17. Shilpa Naik.
18. Sushma Gawas.
19. Alka Gaonkar.
20. Maya Vaigankar.
21. Sugandha Arondekar.
22. Pushpalata Parab.
23. Chaya Mapari.
24. Pravina Pilgaonkar.
25. Vasanti Mandrekar.
26. Pramavati Gawandi.
27. Gulabi Gad.
28. Kalpana Falkar.
29. Pushpa Shirodkar.
30. Anita Shirodkar.
31. Archana Pilgaonkar.
32. Sumati Kamat.
33. Kusum Zalmi.
34. Sarita Gad.
35. Rupa Rawal.
36. Sarita Kubal.
37. Milan Gawandi.
38. Tanuja Gaonkar.
39. Shaila Gaonkar.
40. Maya Gosawi.
41. Seema Naik.
42. Swapna Karbhatkar.
43. Ujwala Salgaonkar.
44. Shevanti Salgaonkar.
45. Sharmila Sakhalikar.
46. Sandhya Mandaikar.
47. Escolao Rodrigues.
48. Sushma Bale.
49. Shevanti Shirodkar.
50. Ujwala Chodankar.
51. Vanita Ghadi.
52. Veena Gaonkar.

- (2) If not, to what relief the above workmen are entitled?

- (3) Whether the demand of the Union representing the above 52 workmen for full wages from 11-01-93 onwards is justified?

- (4) If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled?

2. Upon receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/19/94 and registered A/D notices were issued to both the parties. Pursuant to service of notices, Party I filed a Claim Statement at Exhibit 3 and Party II filed a Written Statement at Exhibit 5.

3. In short, the case of the Party I is that all the workers were working with the Party II since 1987 onwards and all the workman have worked continuously for more than 240 days before the refusal of employment. The Party II is limited company registered under Companies Act engaged in manufacturing of readymade Garments under the name "Wrangler" Jeans in collaboration with multinational company. The Party II was paying very meager wages to the workers and as such the majority of the workmen have joined the Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh in the year 1991. The Union vide their letter dated 09-10-1991 informed Party II that majority of workmen have joined their union and thereafter, on behalf of the workmen submitted the Charter of Demands vide dated 18-10-1991. After the formation of the Union, the management started implementing unfair labour practices, and started the management sponsored Union. It is also claimed by the Party I that after the formation of new management sponsored minority Union, the Party II started harassing the members of Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh and refused to discuss the Charter of demands submitted by Party I. The Party II has failed to initiate the negotiations and as such the workmen and the Union raised a dispute of Charter of demands before the Conciliation Officer, however the Party II did not attend the meetings and entered into a 2(p) settlement with the minority Union without determining the majority character of the Union.

4. The Party I also claimed that in order to secure the justice, the majority workmen initiated an agitation and after the intervention of Labour Commissioner, the management signed a 12(3) settlement dated 28-04-1992 with their Union and after the settlement, the members commenced their work sincerely. The State Government vide their Notification dated 16-07-1992 introduced the minimum wages to the Garment Industry and on the publication of the said Notification, the workmen and the union requested the management for immediate implementation of minimum wages and also the terms of the settlement dated

28-04-1992. However, till December, 1992 they remained quiet and in order to get the justice, the Party I initiated agitation w.e.f. 22-12-1992 and after the intervention of the Labour Commissioner, the strike was withdrawn w.e.f. 10-01-1993. After the withdrawal of the strike, all the workmen went to resume the duty. However, the Party II refused to allow them to resume the duty. The workmen are regular workmen of the company and have worked more than a year continuously before their termination. Party II has failed to comply the provisions of law and did not offer any dues nor any retrenchment compensation paid at the time of termination of the services. The Party II did not obtain any permission from the State Government for retrenchment of the workmen. The termination of the Party I workmen is illegal unjustified and bad in law. All the workmen are unemployed after the termination and are suffering hardship and facing financial constraints due to unemployment. It is therefore necessary relief be granted.

5. In the written statement, the Party II has claimed that the present proceedings are misconceived, baseless and vague. The Party I has no locus standi to initiate proceedings against Party II as there is no dispute of any kind existing in the establishment, neither there was any lockout nor was any strike in the establishment of the Party II and it was functioning normally from time of its inception till date without any obstruction, disturbance or agitation for all these years. The Party II has no collaboration of any kind to any multinational company. The Party II has recognized union i.e. Dupont Sportswear Employees Union as sole bargaining agent as regards to welfare and other amenities of its workers are concerned. The Party II has therefore held deliberations and discussions as regards to payment of wages and other demands with the union considering all their charter of demands and signing the settlement. The Dupont Sportswear Employees Union was formed by its majority of its employees and was representing majority union. The Party I have no relation of any kind with Party II as there was only one union with the Party II and entered into settlement for three years with the said union and as such the dispute raised by the Party I by submitting charter of demands is unfair. The Party II has implemented minimum wage in toto to all the workmen from 16-7-1992. The Party II has neither taken any action nor terminated the services of any of its workmen as falsely alleged. The Party I therefore are not entitled for any reliefs.

6. The Party I filed a rejoinder at Exhibit 6 denying the case put forth by Party II in the Written Statement.

7. Issues framed at Exhibit 7 are as follows:-

- (1) Whether Party I proves that Party II terminated the services of 52 workmen named in the reference by refusing employment to them w.e.f. 11-01-1993?
- (2) Whether Party I proves that the Party II failed to pay the retrenchment compensation nor offered legal dues to the 52 workmen named in the reference at the time of termination of their services and hence the termination is illegal, unjustified and bad in law?
- (3) Whether Party I proves that Party II failed to obtain permission from the Government for retrenchment of the 52 workmen named in the reference before termination of their services and hence the termination is illegal, unjustified and bad in law?
- (4) Whether Party I proves that the refusal of employment by Party II to 52 workmen named in the reference w.e.f. 11-01-1993 amounts to lock-out?
- (5) Whether Party II proves that Party I has no locus standi to espouse the dispute on behalf of the workmen of Party II as it is not a Union representing majority of its workmen and also as no industrial dispute existed between the Party II and its workmen?
- (6) Whether Party II proves that it was compelled to sign the settlement with Party I by the Government machinery and Labour Minister by use of threat?
- (7) Whether Party I is entitled to any relief?
- (8) What Award?

8. In the course of evidence, the Party I examined Shri Puti Gaonkar as witness and produced on record a copy letter dated 9-10-1991 at Exh. W-1, a copy of letter dated 18-10-1991 along with Charter of demands at Exh. W-2 colly, a copy of complaint dated 25-3-1992 addressed to the Secretary (Labour) at Exh. W-3, a copy of settlement dated 28-4-1992 at Exh. W-4, a copy of letter dated 10-1-1993 withdrawing the strike at Exh. W-5, a copy of letter dated 25-11-1991 issued to the Party II regarding one day token strike. The Party I also examined Ms. Bharati Dattaram Tar. On the other hand, Party II examined Shri Mahesh Vaman Dharwadkar and produced on record a copy of charge sheet filed

against workmen by the police at Exh. E-1, a copy of Registration Certificate of Dupont Sportswear Ltd. Employees Union at Exh. E-2, a copy of letter dated 29-4-1992 by Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh to the Labour Minister at Exh. E-3, a copy of letter dated 4-12-1992 by Dupont Sports wear Ltd. Employees Union at Exh. E-4, a copy of letter dated 29-04-1992 by Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh at Exb. E-5, a copy of Settlements dated 14-03-1992 and 12-12-1992 at Exh. E-6 colly, a copy of acceptance letters dated 14-03-1992 given by 18 employees at Exh. E-7 colly, a copy of Pay Sheets dated 18-12-1992 at Exb. E-8 colly, a copy of attendance register for the month of Oct, 1994 at Exh. E-9, copies of the letters dated 01-01-1992 to General Secretary of Party I Union at Exh. E-10 colly, copies of letter dated 1-11-1991 issued by Office of Commissioner, Labour alongwith enclosures at Exh. E-11 colly, a copy letter dated 18-5-1998 issued by Commissioner, Labour to Party II at Exh. E-12. The Party II also examined Shri Atmaram Naik. The Party II also re-examined Shri Mahesh Dharwadkar who produced on record resignation letters of workers at E-12 colly.

9. Heard arguments. Notes of written arguments came to be placed on record by the Party I and Party II.

10. I have gone through the records of the case and have duly considered the arguments advanced. My answers with their findings and reasons thereof are as follows.

- | | | |
|-------------|-----|----------------------------|
| Issue No. 1 | ... | Partly in the Affirmative. |
| Issue No. 2 | ... | Partly in the Affirmative. |
| Issue No. 3 | ... | In the Negative. |
| Issue No. 4 | ... | In the Negative. |
| Issue No. 5 | ... | In the Negative. |
| Issue No. 6 | ... | In the Negative. |
| Issue No. 7 | ... | As per final order. |
| Issue No. 8 | ... | As per final order. |

REASONS

Issue No. 1, 2, 3 and 4:

The above issues are taken up together for discussion as they are inter-related.

11. Learned Advocate Shri S. P. Gaonkar for the Party I has submitted that it is an admitted position that the workmen were not allowed to resume their duties w.e.f. 11-1-1993 after the strike was called off by the union on 10-1-1993 which itself proves that the workers were locked out and hence amounts to lockout without complying with the provision of law and the same is unjustified and bad in law which is confirmed by the settlement signed before the Labour Commissioner at Exh.W-4. The employer has failed to prove that the

workers were absenting themselves whereas the workers were agitating for implementation of minimum wages and terms of settlement. The Settlement dated 14-3-1992 at Exh. E-6 shows that there were 138 workmen which is also admitted by the employer and therefore Chapter V-B of Industrial Disputes Act is applicable to the establishment of the Party II which employer has failed to comply and therefore, the termination of the workers mentioned in the schedule of reference is illegal and bad-in-law.

12. Ld. Adv. Shri Gaonkar has further submitted that the resignation letters produced on record reveal their falsity and that the said letters have not been proved by the management by examining the authors of the said documents. He further submitted that the resignation letters were mostly written by one person and signed by the Manager and not given voluntarily. The said letters were emerged in the year 2002 through Shri Dharwadkar. There is no explanation why the said letters were produced after delay of 6 years. The management has taken a stand that the workers have abandoned their services in 1993 and therefore their resignation letters do not help them in any way and if the termination is under challenge, no worker would give resignation letters. In any event, the management had not conducted any enquiry before refusing employment on the basis of abandonment as laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **G. T. Laad vs. Chemical and Fibers of India Ltd., (1979) 1 SSC 590** and therefore resignation letters have no bearing on the matter of refusal of employment.

13. Per contra, Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar for the Party II has submitted that the management was forced to sign the settlement dated 28-4-1992 at Exh. W-4 due to compulsion and pressure from Government agency. The said settlement before the Commissioner was objected and opposed by all the employees of Party II by submitting a Memorandum/protest letter to Party II and therefore not binding upon them. The Party II started functioning from 1987 and at the relevant time the total number of employees was about 35 and subsequently on later stage, it increased to around 95. It is also submitted that out of 52 workers mentioned in the reference, 41 workers have resigned and taken their full and final settlement and left their services, five workers have joined their duties and only six workmen have neither reported for work nor taken their full and final settlement and therefore they are not entitled for any compensation. He further submitted that the Party II has closed the factory on 19-9-2002 due

to the circumstances prevailing at that time and that the Tribunal has held that the action of Party II in closing down the factory is legal and justified. The Union has no locus standi as no documents have been produced to prove its claim of registration/recognition as representative union on behalf of the workers in the reference or authority to represent the workers in the present case.

14. Be that as it may, out of 52 workmen whose names has been found mentioned in the reference, 41 workmen have resigned and taken their full and final settlement and left the services. The resignation letters at Exh.12 colly clearly show that 41 workmen as mentioned therein have tendered their resignation in full and final settlement. None of the workmen have deposed that their resignations were not voluntary or that they have not tendered the resignation. The management has produced on record the said resignation letters which have not been challenged by the workmen concerned. The resignation letters at E-12 colly therefore clearly show that the 41 workmen out of 52 workers have tendered their resignation and taken full and final settlement and left the services. There is also no dispute that 5 of the workmen have already joined the duties and they are Shaila Gaonkar, Tanuja Gaonkar, Gulabi Gad, Shevanti Salgaonkar and Meena Gaonkar and the workers who have neither joined duties nor accepted the settlement are Bharati Tari, Premavati Gawande, Sumati Kamat, Maya Ghadi, Megha Ghadi and Seema Naik. Shri Puti Gaonkar, the witness of the Party I has admitted that the persons who joined the services did not take his advice before joining the services of the Party II but the fact that five of them have joined the duty and six have not joined the duty is an admitted fact and therefore, 46 workmen out of 52 workmen whose names are mentioned in the reference have no concern of whatsoever nature in respect of present reference.

15. It is claimed by the Party I that the settlement dated 14-3-1992 at Exh. 6 colly shows that there were more than 100 workmen employed before termination which was w.e.f. 1-11-1993 and even Shri Atmaram Naik, witness of Party II has admitted that even in the year 1991, there were more than 100 workers and therefore Chapter V-B of Industrial Disputes Act applies and hence permission for retrenchment under Section 25-N is mandatory. Ld. Adv. Shri S. P. Gaonkar has also submitted that since the said permission is not sought, the action for refusal for employment was void and the workmen were entitled for full back wages. He also submitted that the provisions of Section 25-N

of Industrial Disputes Act is imperative in nature and prior permission of the appropriate Government is mandatory and in support thereof, he relied upon the case of **Oswal Agro Furane and another Ltd. vs. Oswal Agro Furane workers Union and others.**, (2005) 2 SCC 224.

16. Admittedly, Chapter V-B of the Act pertains to special provisions relating to lay-off, retrenchment and closure in certain establishment. Section 25-K relates to industrial establishments (not being an establishment of seasonal character or in which work is performed only intermittently) in which not less than one hundred workmen were employed on an average per working day for preceding twelve months. Section 25-N pertains to conditions precedent to retrenchment of workmen. Section 25-N(b) states that no workman shall be retrenched by the employer without prior permission of appropriate Government. Section V-B of the Act applies to an industrial establishment if number of employees employed in the establishment on an average calculated for twelve months preceding that day on the basis of each working day is more than one hundred. In the instant case, the date preceding twelve months from the alleged date of refusal of employment is 11-1-1992 to 11-1-1993. Exh. E-6 colly is the Memorandum of settlement dated 14-3-1992 produced by Party II signed by Dupont Sportswear Limited Employees Union and Party II wherein annexure shows list of 138 workers. However, there is no record of the workmen employed on an average working day preceding twelve months from 11-1-1993 or the number of workmen employed by Party II on each of the days from 11-1-1992 to 11-1-1993 or the total number of workmen employed by Party II during the said period and in the absence of the said evidence, the reliance of the said Settlement at Exh. E-6 colly will be an exercise in futility.

17. The Party I could have produced on record the copies of returns of Provident Fund and ESI for the said period or the attendance register indicating the number of workmen employed by Party II during the said period. The Memorandum of settlement dated 12-12-1992 at E-6 colly produced by Party II signed by Dupont Sportswear Limited Employees Union and Party II with respect to implementation of minimum wages for category II and III workers however shows list of 59 workers. Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar for the Party II has submitted and rightly so that the Party I has not produced any documents to show that there were more than 100 workmen on an average per working day for the preceding 12 months of the alleged

retrenchment of the workmen. Shri Puti Gaonkar has categorically stated that at the time when the workers of Party II became the members of their union, there were in all 90 workers working with Party II and 78 of them have become the members of their union. The second witness of the Party I, Bharati Tari has also stated that there were in all 90 workers working with the Party II out of which 78 were the members of the union. Shri Atmaram Naik has nowhere stated that at the time of retrenchment or the closure of company there were more than 100 workmen working with the Party II. He, however claimed that about 100 workers were working in the factory of Party II in the year 1991, which is not sufficient in the absence of any documents. There is nothing on record that more than 100 workers were employed at any time in the establishment of Party II. It is therefore, Party I has failed to prove that there were more than 100 workmen employed before termination of their services which was w.e.f. 1-11-1993 and as such, reliance on the case of **Oswal Agro Furane and another Ltd.**, supra is improper considering the facts of the present case.

18. It is also claimed by the Party II that the management of Party II closed the establishment w.e.f. 19-9-2002. The Party II has produced on record the Award dated 29-8-2013 passed by my predecessor in reference No. IT/24/07 between one Swati Kerkar, President of Dupont Sportswear and Manager of Dupont Sportswear Ltd. as the said union had raised the industrial dispute claiming that the closure is an illegal process and it was decided by my predecessor on 29-8-2013 holding that the action of the management of M/s. Dupont Sportswear Pvt. Ltd. at Bicholim Industrial Estate in closing down their factory w.e.f. 19-9-2002 is legal and justified and that the Party I workmen are not entitled to any relief. The above said fact has not been denied. It is not the case of the Party I that the factory has not been closed from 19-9-2002. The union represented by other workers had filed the said dispute in which the Court held that the establishment has been closed. The said Award is therefore binding on the parties as far as the closure of the establishment is concerned. There is nothing on record that the said establishment is still functional after 19-9-2002. The Party I also cannot take a stand of illegal closure of the factory as my predecessor has specifically held that the closure is legal in the Award dated 29-8-2013 and the said award has attained finality as it has neither been challenged by the parties in the said reference nor the parties in the present reference.

19. The Party I therefore has established that out of 52 workmen, only six workmen named above have neither joined the services nor tendered resignation by accepting full and final settlement by refusing employment to them w.e.f. 11-1-1993 and the same is unjustified and bad in law which is confirmed by the settlement signed before the Labour Commissioner at Exh.W-4. The Party I have also proved that the Party II failed to pay the retrenchment compensation nor offered legal dues to the above six workmen named in the reference at the time of termination of their services and therefore, their termination is illegal and bad-in-law and that it amounts to lock-out. However, it has failed to prove that there were more than 100 workmen employed before termination which was w.e.f. 1-11-1993 and therefore was required to obtain permission from the appropriate Government for retrenchment of 52 workmen named in the reference. It is therefore, issue No. 1 and issue No. 2 are partly answered in the affirmative and issue No. 3 and 4 are answered in the negative.

Issue No. 5:

20. Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar for the Party II has admitted that the Party I has not produced on record any documents to prove their claim of registration/recognition as representative union on behalf of the said workers in the reference of the Party II and in the absence of the valid documents, the claim put forth by the Party I deserves no consideration. He also submitted that the union has not produced any documents showing that it is a majority union and therefore the Party I union has no locus standi to represent the said workers. The Party II since its inception was representing the workers in the factory through Dupont Sportswear Limited Employees Union which was registered in the Registrar of Trade Unions in the year 1992 and therefore, the above issue be answered in the affirmative. However, as rightly submitted by Learned Advocate Shri S. P. Gaonkar for Party I the technical points raised by the Party II are not tenable in view of Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act which makes all disputes in relation to termination of service, a deemed industrial dispute irrespective of whether it is supported by a trade union or not, as held in the case of **ANZ Grindlays Bank vs. General Secretary, Grindlays Bank Employees Union, (2001) 3 Mah LJ 422**. It is therefore contention raised by the Party II with respect to locus-standi of Party I union to espouse the dispute on behalf of the union is preposterous. Hence, the above issue is answered in the negative.

Issue No. 6:

21. It is claimed by Party II that they were compelled to sign the settlement with Party I with Government machinery and Labour Minister by use of threat with respect to settlement entered under Section 12(3) of Industrial Disputes Act executed through Labour Commissioner, Panaji. Shri Mahesh V. Dharwadkar has also stated that the said settlement was signed under pressure from the Government machinery in view of letter dated 24-9-1992 written by Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh to the Labour Minister, however there is nothing on record produced by Party II that there was compulsion and pressure from the Government machinery through Labour Commissioner, Panaji. The Party II has also not challenged the said settlement nor filed any written complaints against the said settlement before any higher authority and therefore, the above issue has to be answered in the negative.

Issue No. 7 and 8:

22. Ld. Adv. Shri S.P. Gaonkar for Party I has submitted that the action of Party II in refusing employment and terminating their services is illegal and unjustified. The Party I workmen are therefore entitled to reinstatement in service with full back wages, continuity in service and other benefits. On the converse, Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar for Party II has submitted that the Party I workmen are not entitled for reliefs as claimed by Party I in the claim statement and as such claim filed by Party I be dismissed.

23. The question therefore is what reliefs the Party I/workmen are entitled to, once it is held that the refusal/termination is illegal, whether they are entitled for re-instatement with full back wages and continuity in service with consequential benefits attached to the post or adequate monetary compensation in lieu of reinstatement and back wages.

24. Needless to mention, only six Party I workmen mentioned above are entitled for the reliefs as they neither tendered their resignation nor joined the services. There is nothing on record that the six workmen have resigned or they have also been offered joining of services like other workmen. The Party I have sufficiently proved that the refusal of the services of the above six workmen was illegal and without following the principles of natural justice w.e.f. 11-1-1993. The Party I workmen are claiming Minimum wages in terms of Notification dated 16-7-1992 issued by the appropriate Government to the garment industry and

implementation of the terms of settlement dated 28-4-1992, which they are entitled to. There cannot be any dispute that Party II closed its factory on 19-9-2002. There is nothing on record that Party II is still functioning and is carrying on business at Goa. They are therefore not entitled for reinstatement in service, however in lieu of re-instatement, six workmen of Party I mentioned above are entitled for compensation from date of refusal of services till closure of the establishment of Party II in terms of Section 25-F of Industrial Disputes Act.

25. There is also no dispute that Party I have been demanding minimum wages in terms of Notification dated 16-7-1992 issued by the appropriate Government to the garment industry and implementation of the terms of settlement dated 28-4-1992. The Party II has also entered into other settlements at E-6 colly. The Party II has also claimed that they have implemented minimum wages in toto to all the workmen from 16-7-1992. There is no dispute that no retrenchment compensation was paid nor offered legal dues to the above six workmen named in the reference at the time of refusal/termination of their services and that they are entitled for the said compensation in terms of Section 25-F of the Act from date of refusal/retrenchment till closure of the establishment and minimum wages as per the said Notification and other benefits as per the above settlements. It would therefore be just and proper and in the interest of justice to award the six workers mentioned above compensation in lieu of reinstatement along with back wages in consonance with the Notification dated 16-7-1992 along with other consequential benefits to be calculated on the basis of above Notification and settlements from the date of refusal/retrenchment till closure of the establishment, which would be just, proper and equitable in the facts and circumstances of the case. Hence, the above issues are answered accordingly.

26. In the result, I pass the following:

ORDER

- (i) The reference stands partly allowed.
- (ii) It is hereby held that the action of the management of M/s. Dupont Sportswear Ltd., Bicholim, in refusing to provide employment to the six workmen mentioned above, namely Bharati Tari, Premavati Gawande, Sumati Kamat, Maya Ghadi, Megha Ghadi and Seema Naik, with effect from 11-01-1993 is illegal and unjustified.

- (iii) The Party II is directed to pay compensation to above mentioned six workmen from date of refusal of services till closure of the establishment of Party II in terms of Section 25-F of Industrial Disputes Act in lieu of reinstatement as well as back wages along with other consequential benefits from the date of refusal of service till the date of closure of the establishment to be calculated on the basis of above Notification and Settlements.
- (iv) The Party II is directed to deposit back wages along with other consequential benefits as stated above before the Tribunal within 60 days of the publication of the Award, failing which the Party II shall pay an interest @ 9% per annum.
- (v) Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-
(Vincent D'Silva)
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal and
Labour Court.

◆◆◆
Department of Personnel

—
Order

No. 7/18/2020-PER/2037

The Governor of Goa is pleased to appoint Shri R. Mihir Vardhan, IAS (AGMUT:2003), as Secretary to the Government of Goa, with immediate effect.

Shri R. Mihir Vardhan, (IAS) joined this administration on 20-08-2020 (f. n.).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shashank Thakur, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).
Porvorim, 03rd September, 2020.

—
Order

No. 7/7/2017-PER/2047

Read: Government Order No. 7/7/2017-PER/3352 dated 29-11-2019.

The Governor of Goa is pleased to repatriate Shri Raghuvir G. Keni, Chief Electrical Engineer, Electricity Department, Government of Goa with

effect from 21-09-2020 (a.n.) from the State administration to Mormugao Port Trust.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shashank V. Thakur, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).
Porvorim, 11th September, 2020.

—
Notification

No. 7/3/2019-PER/2044

Read: Notification No. 7/3/2019-PER/1618 dated 20-07-2020.

Notification No. 7/3/2019-PER/1621 dated 21-07-2020.

In partial modification of the Notifications referred in the preamble, the Governor of Goa is pleased to transfer and order the allocation of work/Departments amongst the Secretaries to the Government as follows with immediate effect:-

Sr. No.	Name & Designation	Department
1	2	3
1.	Shri R. Mihir Vardhan, IAS (AGMUT: 2003) Secretary to Governor	1. Secretary to Governor.
2.	Shri Kunal, IAS (AGMUT:2005) Secretary (Elections) & Chief Electoral Officer	1. Chief Electoral Officer. 2. Secretary (Elections). 3. Power. 4. Environment.
3.	Shri Rupesh Kumar Thakur, IAS (AGMUT:2006) Secretary (General Administration)	1. General Administration 2. Civil Supplies. 3. Goa Gazetteer. 4. Printing and Stationery. 5. Museum. 6. Protocol.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shashank V. Thakur, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).
Porvorim, 10th September, 2020.

◆◆◆
Department of Public Health

—
Order

No. 7/3/91-1/PHD/3114

Read: Memorandum No. 7/3/91-I/PHD dated 24-4-2020.

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their letter No. COM/I/5/56(1)/2019/403 dated 25-2-2020, Government is pleased to appoint the following Drugs Inspectors (Group "B" Gazetted) in Level 7 of Pay Matrix [Pay Band-2 of Rs. 9,300-34,800 with Rs. 4,600 Grade Pay (pre-revised)] under the Directorate of Food & Drugs Administration with immediate effect as per the terms and conditions contained in the Memorandum cited above:

1. Mr. Samuel Soares.
2. Ms. Swati Dattatraya Bhende.
3. Ms. Saipriyanka Vishnu Gauns.
4. Ms. Bindia Umakant Naik Dessai.

They shall be on probation for a period of two years with effect from the date of their joining.

They have been declared medically fit by the Medical Board. Their appointment is made subject to their verification of character and antecedents. In the event of any adverse matter being noticed by the Government on verification of their character and antecedents, their services shall be terminated.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Swati A. Dalvi, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim, 08th September, 2020.

Order

No. 23/20/2014-I/PHD/PART IV/3093

Dr. Rajesh Patil, Associate Professor in Surgery and Dr. Sunanda Amonkar, Associate Professor in Medicine, Goa Medical College are appointed as Nodal Officers for the new South Goa District Hospital for management of COVID-19 patients.

Both the Doctors will be on rotation basis and will manage the activities of the South Goa District Hospital (COVID Hospital) under the Dean, Goa Medical College.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Swati A. Dalvi, Under Secretary (Health).

Porvorim, 09th September, 2020.

Order

No. 23/20/2014-I/PHD/Part IV/3092

Dr. Deepa Correia, Senior Surgeon who is holding the charge of Medical Superintendent-cum-Dy. Director of Hospicio Hospital, Margao, shall also look after the responsibilities of new South Goa District Hospital, Margao with immediate effect.

Dr. Deepa Correia shall follow the similar arrangement existing in ESI Hospital for the new South Goa District Hospital, Margao.

Dr. Deepa Correia shall also co-ordinate with the Nodal Officers at the new South Goa District Hospital, Margao as well as ESI Hospital, Margao in providing medicines which are required for the above Hospitals that are available with the Directorate of Health Services in consultation with the Dean, Goa Medical College alongwith the Nodal Officers and Director of Health Services.

The medicines that are not available with the Directorate of Health Services will be provided by the Goa Medical College and Hospital.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Swati A. Dalvi, Under Secretary (Health).

Porvorim, 09th September, 2020.

Memorandum

No. 10/5/94-I/PHD/3095

- Read: 1. Memorandum No. 10/5/94-I/PHD/2242 dated 04-10-2019.
2. Memorandum No. 10/5/94-I/PHD/2407 dated 24-10-2019.

Whereas, this Department vide Memorandum read at preamble (1) had shown the name of Dr. Iona A. Barreto, Junior Physician with the remarks that the Directorate of Vigilance vide Order No. 5/59/2009-VIG/2392 dated 10-09-2019, had ordered major penalty of dismissal from service which shall ordinarily be a disqualification for future employment under the Government was imposed on Dr. Iona A. Barreto, Junior Physician.

And whereas, this Department vide Memorandum read at preamble (2) issued final seniority deleting the name of Dr. Iona A. Barreto, from the seniority list in the grade of Junior Physician.

And whereas, the Appellate Authority/Hon. Chief Minister vide Order No. 5/59/2009-VIG/3004 dated 30-10-2019 modified the Order dated 10-09-2019 with regards to the 'dismissal from service' in respect of Dr. Iona A. Barreto.

And whereas, a tentative seniority calling for objections to the seniority assigned therein if any was circulated vide Memorandum dated 19-08-2020.

Now therefore, since no objections have been received within the time limit, the final seniority list of the Officers is drawn in the grade of Junior Physician under the Directorate of Health Services, as under:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Doctor	Date of Appointment Order	Date of joining	Date of birth	Qualification
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Dr. Iona A. Barreto	27-09-2005	28-09-2005	21-02-1972	MBBS, MD, DNB Med XCPC Medicine.
2.	Dr. Damodar alias Swapnil Subhash Arsekar	11-01-2013	13-03-2013	08-08-1983	MBBS, MD (Internal Medicine).
3.	Dr. Hubert Viegas	10-05-2018	21-05-2018	04-03-1977	MBBS, DGM, PG, Diebetology.
4.	Dr. Swapnil Madhav Naik	10-05-2018	14-05-2018	07-01-1986	MBBS, MD (Medicine).
5.	Dr. Saphallya Vishal Sardesai	15-05-2020	16-07-2020	28-11-1990	MBBS, MD (Medicine).

Swati A. Dalvi, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim, 08th September, 2020.

Memorandum

No. 10/3/94-I/PHD/3108

A tentative seniority list of the Officers in the grade of Junior Ophthalmic Surgeon under the Directorate of Health Services was circulated vide Memorandum No. 10/3/94-I/PHD/2983 dated 14-08-2020.

Since no objections have been received, the final seniority list of the Officers is drawn in the grade of Junior Ophthalmic Surgeon under the Directorate of Health Services, as under:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Doctor	Date of appointment order	Date of joining	Date of birth	Qualification	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Dr. Rhuta R. Shevade	19-05-2016	01-09-2016	31-07-1982	MBBS, DNB (Ophthalmology)	Seniority stands finalised vide Order dated 08-05-2018.
2.	Dr. Valerie Menezes	10-10-2019	02-01-2020	13-11-1987	MBBS, MS (Ophthalmology)	

Swati A. Dalvi, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim, 10th September, 2020.

Memorandum

No. 46/1/2009-I/PHD/3121

A tentative Seniority list of the Officers in the grade of Junior Orthopaedic Surgeon under the Directorate of Health Services was circulated vide Memorandum No. 46/1/2009-I/PHD/2998 dated 17-08-2020.

Since no objections have been received, the final seniority list of the Officers is drawn in the grade of Junior Orthopaedic Surgeon under the Directorate of Health Services, as under:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Doctor	Date of appointment order	Date of joining	Date of birth	Qualification
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Dr. Ismail Shaikh	16-05-2018	16-07-2018	20-01-1985	MBBS, MS (Orthopaedics).
2.	Dr. Bansi Vasudev Naik Khaunte	12-09-2018	25-09-2018	21-08-1989	MBBS, MS (Orthopaedics).
3.	Dr. Prajyot Gurudas Kandolkar	27-05-2020	08-06-2020	14-05-1987	MBBS, MS (Orthopaedics).

Swati A. Dalvi, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim, 10th September, 2020.

**Department of Social Welfare**

Directorate of Social Welfare

Notification

No. 81-2-97-SDB/PART-III/2238

Government is pleased to constitute State Level Committee of Nasha Mukh Bharat Campaign for the State of Goa. State consisting of the following members to advise the Government on effective and co-ordinate implementation of the Nasha Mukh Bharat Campaign at State level and to perform such other functions in relation to Nasha Mukh Bharat Campaign in the State as may be specified by the Government.

State Level Nasha Mukh Bharat Campaign Committee

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| 1. Secretary (Social Welfare) | — Chairperson. |
| 2. Representative of DG Police | — Member. |
| 3. Secretary (Health) | — Member. |
| 4. Representative of Narcotics Control Bureau | — Member. |
| 5. Director of Higher Education | — Member. |
| 6. Director of School Education | — Member. |
| 7. Director of Women & Child Welfare | — Member. |
| 8. Director of Information & Publicity | — Member. |

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 9. Kripa Foundation, Anjuna Vagator Road, Bardez-Goa | — Member. |
| 10. Shri S. V. Naik, Retired Civil Servant | — Member. |
| 11. Shri Mohan Naik, Retired Civil Servant | — Member. |
| 12. Shri Narayan Navthi, Retired Civil Servant | — Member. |
| 13. Mr. Aneesh V. Suresh—State Co-ordinator of Project Monitoring Unit (PMU) of Social Justice, Government of India | — Member. |
| 14. Director of Social Welfare | — Member Secretary. |

Terms of reference of the Committee is as follows:-

1. Formulating a State Campaign Activity under Nasha Mukh Bharat Campaign.
2. Ensuring formulation, guiding, over seeing and implementation of District Level Nasha Mukh Campaigns in identified vulnerable districts in the State.
3. Conducting training programmes for the service providers at State, District and below District Level.
4. Visit to the institutions, hospitals for assessment of preparedness and implemen-

tation and ensuring strict implementation of ban on sale of cigarettes with 100 meters of any educational institution (Rule refers).

5. Obtaining information on the availability/ /sale of drugs and review the action taken on such information.

The non-official members shall be entitled for honarium of Rs. 1,500/- for sitting.

The State Level Nasha Mukta Campaign Committee would meet once in two months.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Umeshchandra L. Joshi, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Social Welfare).

Panaji, 10th September, 2020.



Department of Town and Country Planning

Office of the Chief Town Planner (Administration)

Order

No. 17/01/TC-UD/TCP/2015-17/1404

The following transfers of officers in the Town and Country Planning Department is issued in public interest as detailed below:

Sr. No.	Name of the officer and designation	Present posting	Proposed posting
1.	Shri Ritesh Shirodkar, Dy. Town Planner	Town & Country Planning Department (HQ), Panaji	Town & Country Planning Department, Tiswadi Taluka office.
2.	Shri Shivprasad P. Murari, Dy. Town Planner	Town & Country Planning Department, Tiswadi Taluka office	Town & Country Planning Department (HQ), Panaji.

The officers are hereby directed to join their new place of posting with immediate effect without availing joining time. The officer at Sr. No. 1 shall move first.

This is issued as per the direction of the Government under reference No. 1722 dated 07-09-2020.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

James Mathew, Chief Town Planner (Administration).

Panaji, 08th September, 2020.

www.goaprintingpress.gov.in

Published and Printed by the Director, Printing & Stationery,
Government Printing Press,
Mahatma Gandhi Road, Panaji-Goa 403 001.

PRICE—Rs. 16.00

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING PRESS, PANAJI-GOA—187/160-9/2020.